SOME NEW BOOKS.

Colonial History.

The latest contribution to "The Story of the Nation" series is presented in two volumes entitled *The Thirteen Colonies*, by HELEN AINSLIE SMITH (Putnam's). The author tells us that her narrative is intended for the general reader, rather than for the special student, though, at the same time, she has aimed to make it thoroughly acceptable as trustworthy history. The method of exposition which she has adopted is to set forth separately the record of each of the Thirteen Colonies, from its first settlement to the Declaration of Independence. Each plantation is depicted on its geographical background and the decisive events in the course of its evolution are exhibited. There is no doubt that at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War each of the colonies regarded itself as a distinct political entity, and would have expected its development to be distinctly treated by the historian. That was, indeed, the principle upon which Colonial histories were written, and the author of this work has done wisely to conform to it. We can only get the right point of view by keeping steadily in mind the fact that not only at the date of the Declaration of Independence, but for a long time afterward, the colonists looked upon themselves not as citizens of the United States, but as citizens of Virginia, of South Carolina, of New York or of Massachusetts.

The author's first volume is devoted to the four colonies, which, as she says, were first settled, to wit: Virginia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York. We shall recur to this arrangement. Before the settlement of Virginia is recounted, a chapter on "The Forerunners" is introduced. We observe that the author refrains from speculating on the fate of Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, though there is some doubt as to the soundness of the current assumption that all the men, women and children composing the settlement were massacred by the Indians. On the other hand, we find due attention paid to the northerly expedition of Capt. Bartholomew Gosnold, which had far-reaching consequences, being the true precursor of the voyages which resulted in the settlement of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. Gosnold, instead of first steering southward, steered as nearly as possible due west for the haven discovered by the Florentine mariner, Verrazano, a haven which has been identified with Newport. It was this expedition which opened a new route to the Western hemisphere, by making the Azores a station for supplies and repairs, instead of the West Indies, and by shortening the voyage some fifteen hundred miles in distance and a week in time. We are reminded that Gosnold made his landfall in Casco Bay, near Maine, and thence coasting southward, named Cape Cod, as well as Martha's Vineyard. Subsequently he explored the islands at the mouth of Buzzard's Bay. He did not carry out his intention of founding a colony but, besides opening a new route, his voyage gave Englishmen for the first time a full account of a long stretch of seaboard fit for settlement, possessed, as it was, of good harbors, well timbered and adapted to the cultivation of wheat and flax. This was, as we have said, the voyage to which was primarily due the colonization of New England.

In a chapter on "The Ancient and Most Loyal Dominion" the fact is recalled that, although Virginia was disposed to adhere to the second and third Stuart Kings against the Parliament, yet Bacon's Rebellion in this colony preceded the insurrections against the mother country which took place in New York and Massachusetts during the seventeenth century. But for Bacon's sudden death the reforms demanded by the Virginian rebels would, probably, have been conceded. Once more, namely, in 1688, before the outbreak of the revolution in England, the Virginians defied the power of James II. It is this incident which, coupled with Bacon's Rebellion, enables us to comprehend the stand taken by Virginia against the Stamp Act, and, afterwards at the date of the Declaration of Independence. It is an interesting circumstance, often overlooked, that under William and Mary Sir Edmond Andros, although hated beyond any other man of his day in New York and New England, got on very well for six years as Lieutenant-Governor of the Old Dominion. It was only when he tried to assert authority over the newly chartered College of William and Mary that his recall from the province was procured.

What we miss in the chapters allotted to Virginia is an account of the manners and customs of the Tidewater planters. For the economic, social and industrial condition of the Old Dominion in the middle of the eighteenth century the reader must look elsewhere. We encounter a similar deficiency, though it is somewhat less pronounced, in that part of the book which describes the fortunes of the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and New Hampshire. It is pleasant to record that in her thirteenth chapter the author writes accurately and sympathetically about the stormy period of nearly two years in the history of the New York Colony known as Leisler's Rebellion. There is no doubt that Leisler, who was represented by his enemies as a self-seeking rebel, and was wrongly put to death, was a patriotic martyr, and used the brief authority thrust upon him to set up the most enlightened government the province had ever had. Unflinching, too, is the author's description of the piracy which flourished in New York in the last decade of the seventeenth century, to which the town owed a great and sudden accession of wealth. The truth is, that no sooner had William III. declared that his subjects in America might take out letters of marque against the French merchant service, than all New Yorkers, from Governor to chimney sweep, went into privateering. Neither were they particular to chase only an enemy's vessels, but, on the contrary, overhauled every craft they dared attack, whether engaged in the Dutch, or even in the English, East India trade. At first stolen cargoes were boldly brought into port at New York and entered as privateer prizes in the Admiralty Court, where they were sold by due process of law. When the piratical traffic increased, however, a place of exchange was organized on the island of Madagascar, where were storehouses and docks and regular merchantmen always at hand to exchange cargoes with the first pirate captain who came in or to buy the latter's plunder for cash, and convey it to New York as East India goods legitimately secured. This trade grew enormously in a few years. The city was filled with Oriental luxuries. Money was plentiful in coin of all nations, and the merchant families indulged in unheard of extravagance. It was to hunt down these pirates that Capt. Kidd was made by Lord Bellomont, Governor of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, commander of a King's cruiser, whereupon Kidd turned pirate himself.

The author is right in saying, as she does in her fourteenth chapter, that, before the passage of the Stamp act and for some years also after the repeal of that measure, a majority of the inhabitants of the Province of New York, as well as the great body of rich and influential persons, were strongly in favor of submission to the King. Unquestionably, the Church of England was more firmly established in New York than in any other Northern colony. Supported by the rich English families—the Dutch clung to the so-called Reformed Church—the Anglican Church in its turn maintained a great many poor people on whose loyalty it could count. The institution of domestic slavery and the law of primogeniture, which had obtained for nearly a century and a half, had fostered aristocratic feeling and strenuous opposition to the tendency of upstarts to claim a share in the government. It was this spirit which made the city of New York a Royalist stronghold. Then, again, the Scotch Highlanders on the frontier were inflexibly loyal, and the farmers of Dutch, German and French descent were too deeply prejudiced against the people of New England to share the latter's political sentiments. The interests of the landed proprietors and the rich merchants were so bound to the home government that to them resistance meant serious loss, and, sometimes, ruin. Nevertheless, a considerable section of the younger members of the great families formed, in conjunction with many small merchants, a moderate party, which, while, for several years, it counselled patience and compromise, gradually swelled the ranks of those who held that there was no submission but in slavery. Ultimately, the spirit of opposition to the Stamp act was, perhaps, stronger in New York than in any other colony. One result of its recalcitrant attitude was that this province, which had possessed a larger trade than any other, lost five-sixths of it by keeping the pledges against the payment of taxes levied by the British Parliament. At New York, earlier than at Boston, was a tea ship boarded and its cargo thrown overboard by patriots.

Without examining in detail the author's account of the circumstances under which the other nine colonies were founded, we note the reasons which she gives for arranging them in the following order of settlement: Virginia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. There is no doubt about Virginia's title to primacy in order of time, but why should Massachusetts have the second place, which most writers assign to New York? Because, according to tradition, the first lasting settlement effected by Englishmen within the limits of the United States (after the settlement of Jamestown) was made in Maine, which from 1677, if not earlier, up to 1820 was a district of Massachusetts. In the summer of 1607 Chief Justice Sir John Popham, acting under the authority of the Plymouth Company, "made what is now reckoned as the first permanent plantation in New England." The command of the expedition was given to Sir John's kinsman, Capt. George Popham, and Raleigh Gilbert. "Three months after the planting of Jamestown in south Virginia these wayfarers built Fort Popham or Fort St. George at the mouth of the Kennebec on what they called the peninsula of Sabino, now in the town of Phippsburg. They also called the place Pemaquid, a name afterward fixed on a more easterly peninsula. They mounted their fort with four guns and built a church, a storehouse and some dwellings. During the winter the company suffered horribly from the cold; the storehouse was burned, no mines were found and Capt. Popham died. In the spring, hearing from the Captain who brought them supplies that Sir John Popham was dead, part or all of the company dejectedly went back to England. Some chroniclers state that this was the end of the plantation, while others give proof that the Chief Justice's son, Sir Francis Popham, never allowed it to be abandoned." A record shows that in 1612 he had some sort of a company under Francis Williams opposite Monhegan, where, no doubt, his (Popham's) agents lived all the year round collecting furs; "and many scattered settlers were living round about," giving the French cause to complain that "the English showed a desire to be masters of the country." When in 1614 Capt. John Smith visited north Virginia, to which he gave the name of New England, he found one of Popham's ships at Pemaquid, a port his people had used for "many years," Smith said, "monopolizing the fur trade."

On what ground is New Hampshire placed third in order of settlement? Our author thinks that the third foothold of Englishmen on the Atlantic seaboard was probably secured soon after 1614, if not before. A small station for both river and sea fishing, like the first Pemaquid, it was put for convenience off the mouth of the Piscataqua River on the Isles of Shoals, which were discovered, some say, by Champlain, but first made known to Englishmen by Capt. John Smith. Here the cod were not only abundant, but twice as large and heavy as those of the Newfoundland Banks. The climate, moreover, then as now, was singularly mild and uniform, free to a great extent from the sharp winds and fogs that beset the bays of Casco and Massachusetts. This even temperature "enabled the fishermen to prepare by a process of alternate drying and sweating without salt the famous dun or dumbfish, which brought three or four times the price of Poor John and Haverdine prepared at Newfoundland."

Even admitting that the Isles of Shoals, which belong to New Hampshire, were permanently settled from 1614, we can hardly assert with confidence that the settlement was earlier than that of New York. So much, indeed, our author herself seems to admit. It is certain that in 1611 Hendricks Christaensen of Cleves and Adriaen Block, with Capt. Ryser, confirmed Henry Hudson's report of the discovery of the river that bears his name. "In 1613, Christaensen and Block returned and the next year at latest three trading vessels came out from Amsterdam and Hoorn. By this time there was certainly a factory on the end of the Manahattas' Land." The States-General, claiming the region between the fortieth and forty-fifth parallels, gave a charter for three years from January, 1615, to the United New Netherland Company. In the spring of 1622 the Amsterdam Chamber of the Dutch West India Company took possession of New Netherland, which extended, it was claimed, from the Connecticut to the South, now Delaware, River.

There are those who assert that New Jersey deserves not the fifth place which our author assigns to it, but the second, or, at any rate, the third. The evidence for the claim is set forth in the second volume of the book before us. "Some say that the Dutch traders sent out in 1610 selected the rocky shoulder of land now known as Jersey City Heights for a factory and redoubt at the same time they established a post on Manhattan Island. Four years later three scouts from Fort Nassau on the Noorde, or North River, following streams and Indian trails in search of peltries came upon what they called the Zuyde, or South River—the English name was Delaware—and descended it with delight, until they were captured by some Indians and held for ransom. Then a runner, probably taking the trail from what is now Gloucester, crossed the peninsula and carried the news to the Dutch at the mouth of the North River."

Capt. Cornelius Hendricksen went around by sea after the captives, exploring both the Delaware Bay and river, and finding the region abounding in game. In 1622, when the Dutch West India Company sent out their first colony, the head of the expedition, Capt. Mey, besides settling, as some believed, a body of colonists about the mouth of the North River on the Jersey Heights near the redoubt, took eight single men and four couples to the place on the Delaware where the scouts had been captured. At the mouth of Timmer Kill, or Timber Creek, now a branch of the Gloucester River, he planted the settlers in a log blockhouse; other strong houses were built near what are now Burlington and Trenton, apparently because they were at the end of well-beaten Indian trails, coming from what is now New York Bay.

Delaware, which our author regards as the sixth colony, seems to have been founded as early as 1630. One of the directors of the Dutch West India Company was a celebrated traveller and colonizer, Capt. De Vries. In his service Peter Heyes brought out a well-equipped colony of thirty-four persons during the spring of the year just named and settled them under command of Gillis Hossett in and about a fort called Oplandt, which was near what is now the town of Lewes. The next year, when De Vries himself arrived with more colonists, he found Oplandt a blackened ruin, its occupants having been massacred by the savages. He seems to have blamed his representative Hossett for the catastrophe, as he afterward said: "We lost our settlements in the Hoorn Creek by mere jangling with the Indians." As there is reason to believe, however, that the whale fisheries established there were not abandoned, our author accepts the settlement at Oplandt as the first white men's foothold in what is now Delaware. It was in the winter of 1637-38 that the Swedes began their attempt to colonize Delaware and the adjoining parts of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

It is common to think of Maryland as a colony of much later date than Massachusetts Bay. As a matter of fact, the two plantations were nearly contemporaneous. As our author reminds us, the forerunners of the colony of Maryland, to which she allots the seventh place, were Virginia traders. About the year 1631 they fixed stations on the Patuxent River and elsewhere in the upper Chesapeake, especially on Kent Island, which, in 1632, sent a Burgess to the Assembly at Jamestown. In the same year, notwithstanding the hostility of the Virginians to the project, Charles I. created a palatinate for Lord Baltimore out of the region between the Potomac River and the fortieth parallel. The palatinate included not only all the territory of the present State, but also a broad strip to the northward of what is now Mason and Dixon's line, together with the whole of the State of Delaware and a portion of West Virginia. Within a year after the charter passed the seals Leonard Calvert as Governor crossed the Atlantic with the best equipped company that England had ever sent to America.

Pennsylvania was settled nearly fifty years before it was granted to William Penn. The evidence on this point is condensed by our author in a few sentences. It seems to be true that the Dutch built Fort Beversrede in 1633 on a tract purchased from the Indians, including the meeting place of several trails at the mouth of the Manaiung River, which men going westward from the South River found so difficult to descry that the Dutch called it Schuylkill, the Hidden Creek. Whether Beversrede ever was much of a settlement or not, the New Netherlanders had an enormous peltry trade there for about five years, till Peter Minuit's colony of Swedes took possession of another important creek in what is now Delaware. A few years later, about 1640, the Swedes planted another town, much nearer Beversrede, which they called Upland, and the English afterward renamed Chester. A few years later John Printz, the most masterful of the Swedish Governors, made his headquarters for eight years on the island of Tenacong, or Tinicum, at the mouth of the Schuylkill. It was not until July, 1681, that the first expedition sent out by William Penn landed at Upland. Soon afterward Penn was notified that he had made a mistake in the location of the fortieth parallel; that Upland, and even the site for Philadelphia, were below that line. Penn, however, had influence enough to obtain in August, 1682, patents to the whole region south of Philadelphia as far as Cape Henlopen in fee simple, though he did not then acquire political rights within this addition to his original grant.

It is a matter of doubt whether Connecticut was not settled earlier than Pennsylvania. This seems to be acknowledged by our author, though she decides in favor of the last-named colony. "Some assert that a part of the first colony of Walloons brought out in 1623 built a factory and settled" on the river known by the name of Conightieute, an Indian word for "Long" River. "Certainly Dutch shallops were soon on the river, buying 1,000 beaverskins a year from the Pequots, the overlords of the whole region. In 1632 Director Van Twiller planted the arms of the States-General on the west side of the river's mouth, and "in the next year Commissary Jacob Van Curler bought from the Pequots large tracts on the western bank up the river, including Suckiag and both sides of the Little River, now in Hartford. On the southern bank of this stream he threw up earthworks, mounted two guns and built a well-stockaded blockhouse and factory," which the English called Fort Good Hope. It was in October of the same year, 1633, that William Holmes, coming from the Plymouth Colony, made a small settlement on the Dutch side of the Connecticut at the Tunxis, now Farmington, River. It was not until a little later that the noteworthy migration from Massachusetts Bay took place.

About the date of the first settlement in the present State of Rhode Island there is, we believe, no controversy. It was in the spring of 1636 that Roger Williams, who had been warned away from a hut which he had built on the Seekonk River, chose the peninsula between the Mooshassuck and Woonasquatucket for his colony, which he named Providence. Two years later the second Narragansett colony was planted by William Coddington and other emigrants from Massachusetts at the mouth of the bay on Aquedneck, the largest of the islands, on which Newport now stands.

It is needless to say that, in point of date, Georgia was the thirteenth and South Carolina the twelfth colony. A beginning was made, however, to colonize the region which we now call North Carolina nearly ten years before Charles II. erected the tract between Virginia and Florida into the palatinate of Carolina. About the year 1653 the green shores and land-locked, sand-barred bays of what was afterward called Albemarle Sound were first settled as part of Virginia. In the year named Roger Greene, a clergyman of the Puritan District of Nancemond, obtained from the Virginia Assembly the grant of a thousand acres around the mouth of the Chowan River, or Passamagnus, and began his plantation with a hundred men. These people seem to have left no records of their own, and the Virginia Chroniclers gave them no more than a passing reference. The Assembly, anxious to fix their claim upon the country, gave, some eight years later, another grant to one George Duren, or Durant, commonly supposed to have been a Quaker. He "did for the space of two years bestow much labor and cost in finding out the said country," making the settlement and giving his name to Durant's Neck. Among other shadowy figures of this period was one named Edward Catchmaid, or Cathmaid, who is said to have been intrusted by Durant with power to do business in the Virginia Assembly concerning grants, who treacherously took out patents in his own name, and led forth a colony of some sixty persons with negro slaves. These pioneers to the southward were too far from Tidewater Virgina to know or care what was going on in England but they learned after a time that the Commonwealth had fallen, that the monarchy had been restored, and that his new Majesty, Charles II., had set up a great province of Carolina between the thirty-sixth parallel and the river St. Johns. For a considerable time, however, the settlers near Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds had nothing to do with the more southern plantations in the province.

Saintsbury's History of Criticism.

It is, practically, a new task which Mr. GEORGE SAINTSBURY has essayed in *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe from the Earliest Texts to the Present Day* (Dodd, Mead & Co.). Dr. Johnson projected a work of the kind, but did not carry it out. There have been, apparently, but two actual attempts to deal with the whole subject. One of these is an Italian book, "Della Critica," by B. Mazzarella, which is said to be merely a torso. Open to the same objection is Thery's *Histoire des Opinions Littéraires*, because it deals with no later English writers than Campbell and Blair. In the volume before us the author confines himself to a review of classical and mediæval criticism; but this will be followed by a second, treating of the matter from the Renaissance to the death of eighteenth century classicism, and by a third on modern criticism. That the book is intended for the general reader is evident from the fact that biographical and lexicographical details are not suffered to cumber the text, but are incorporated in an appendix. It is to be noted that the translations from the Greek and Latin writers cited are not borrowed, but are Mr. Saintsbury's own: he has aimed in them, he tells us, at closeness rather than elegance. The work may be termed exhaustive in the sense that no writer is passed over who throws any light upon the Greek, the Latin or the mediæval principles of criticism. Naturally, however, the author lays most stress upon Aristotle, Horace, Quintilian, Longinus (we name them, of course, in chronological order) and upon Dante (the De Vulgari Eloquio), though adequate attention is paid to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or the work attributed to him, to Plutarch, to Lucian, to Petrarch and to Boccaccio. Here we can glance only at the author's analysis of the views propounded by Aristotle, Horace, Quintilian, Longinus and Dante.

I.

Mr. Saintsbury begins by showing that criticism in Greece started from two different sources. The first was the strong philosophizing tendency working upon the earliest documents (the most important being then, as now, identified with the name of Homer) and subjecting them to processes which oftenest took the form of a kind of rationalizing allegory. The second was the invention for more or less practical purposes of the art of rhetoric or persuasive composition. The dominance of oratory was long maintained, and continued almost to the latest times to prevent rhetoric, or the art of prose, from assuming its proper position as "speech craft" in the widest sense, that is to say the art of artificially arranged language. As Greek literature, however, both verse and prose, multiplied, it presented more and more temptation to the Greek aptitude for philosophical inquiry. So, after a century or more of progress and exercise, we are confronted in the "Poetics" of Aristotle with an art of poetry incomplete in certain ways, but singularly mature in its own way, and in his "Rhetoric," with an art of prose, which, though it has not yet by any means recognized its true scope and nature, but persists in regarding itself as an art of persuasion merely, has yet accumulated many valuable observations.

Both the art of poetry and the art of prose were, however, seriously obstructed in Greece by the unequal growth of literary kinds, and by the absence of any other literature with which to compare such kinds as existed. The art of poetry was prejudicially affected by the accidental lateness of prose fiction in Greek literature, just as was the art of prose by the accidental predominance of Greek oratory. The habit of generalizing from limited facts led to very arbitrary theories. The epic, for instance, exemplified in the "Iliad," was exalted, but romance, which may be termed a "loose" epic, was barred as improper. Then, again, a single, though in its way, nearly perfect form of tragedy was assumed to be the only one possible or permissible. So, too, the accidental and easily separable extravagances and licenses of the Old Comedy were allowed to obscure its merits and depress its rank in the eyes of the critics. Lyric poetry became a mere appendage to tragedy. In like manner history, of which Thucydides and Herodotus had produced magnificent examples, was regarded as a sort of baggage wagon to oratorical rhetoric.

These mischiefs, though considerable, are, in Mr. Saintsbury's opinion, surpassed by those attributable to the ignorance of foreign languages. If we may challenge comparison with the ancients in criticism, it is due almost wholly to our possession of an infinitely larger stock of accumulated literature and to the fact that this literature is distributed over the most various times, nations and languages. It is the rarest thing in any time to find a critic of the first class who is not acquainted with any literature except his own. Even in antiquity there was no critic approaching the first class except Aristotle who suffered the full consequences of exposure to this disability. Cicero, Horace, Dionysius, Quintilian and Longinus knew both Greek and Latin. Aristotle, on the other hand, had no "tongue of comparison," and, even if he had been stocked with Egyptian and Sanskrit knowledge, it would have done him but little good, unless, as Mr. Saintsbury suggests, it might have corrected his delusion as to the necessary connection of poetry and fiction.

II.

Mr. Saintsbury recognizes that it would be at once ungrateful and Philistine to ignore the debt which we owe to Aristotle. He is far from underrating the enormous positive advance which was made in the "Poetics" and the "Rhetoric." He would even compare it with the advance from chaos to cosmos; he can find nothing elsewhere to match it, though the resurrection of criticism with the revival of learning, and the reformation of it in the Romantic era come nearest to Aristotle's achievement. In the first place, we find in Aristotle nearly all the great kinds of literature discerned, marked off and furnished with definitions. The most important of all the demarcations between poetry and prose, to wit: metre (prose must not have metre, yet should not lack rhythm) is rather taken for granted than argued out; but at least it is taken for granted. The several kinds of poetry are clearly distinguished and, although prose is less adequately treated, a good deal is done in this direction also. In fine, the field of literary criticism is pretty fairly mapped out. Again, the plan of taking actually accomplished works of art and endeavoring to ascertain how it is that they give artistic pleasure is, with some falterings, pursued by Aristotle.

The "Imitation" doctrine propounded in the "Poetics" is regarded by Mr. Saintsbury as the first attempt, and an attempt which has not been much bettered in all the improvements upon it, to adjust the proportions of nature and art which should exist in poetry. Whatever Aristotle did mean exactly by imitation, he certainly did not mean mere copying, mere tracing or plaster of paris moulding from nature. He would not have deemed it the function of the drama "to hold, as it were, a mirror up to nature," for he objected to another's use of the "mirror" as a description of the "Odyssey." Upon this point Mr. Saintsbury observes: "A mirror reproduces passively, slavishly, and without selection or alteration; the artist selects, adapts, adjusts, and, if necessary, alters. This is the true doctrine, and all deviations from it, whether in the shape of realism, impressionism and the like in the one direction, or of adherence to generalized conventionalities on the other, have always led to mischief soon or late. The artist must be the mime, not the mirror; the reasonable, discreet, free-willed agent, not the passive medium. The single dictum of Aristotle's that poetry does not necessarily deal with the actual, but with the possible—that it is, therefore, more philosophic, higher, more universal than history—though it requires both extension and limitation—will put us more in the true critical position than any dictum that we find earlier, or than most dicta that we shall find later."

It is further to be noted that Aristotle recognized the all-important law that the end of art is pleasure. In him there is scarcely a trace of the Platonic depreciation of pleasure. That what we have to demand of a literary work is pleasure, and the specific pleasure it is qualified to give now seems to us a matter of course. In fact, however, Aristotle himself is not free from the charge of having sometimes overlooked it, while, since his time, the great majority of critical errors are traceable to this very overlooking. "The obstinate ignoring, or the captious depreciation of Latin literature by the later Greeks; the wooden 'arts of poetry' of the Latins themselves; the scorn of the Renaissance for mediæval literature; of Du Bellay for Marot; of Harvey for the 'Faerie Queene;' of Restoration criticism for the times before Mr. Waller improved our numbers; of our Romantic critics for Dryden and Dr. Johnson, and of Mr. Matthew Arnold for French poetry, all these things and many others of the same class" come from the obstinate insistence that a particular thing shall be other than it is, that a particular poet shall be, not himself, but somebody else.

Again, whatever may be thought of the relative importance assigned to plot and to character by Aristotle, as well as of not a few minor details of his theory of plot or action, Mr. Saintsbury holds that "there is no denying the huge lift given to the intelligent enjoyment of literature by the distinction of these two important elements and by the analysis of action if not of character. With the aid of such refinements we cease, as Dryden had it, to like grossly,' to accept our pleasure without distinction as to its gradations or inquiry into its source. The artist no longer aims in the dark; his purposes are no longer mere rules, if rules at all, of thumb." Most of the points thus far mentioned, however, are not beyond the reach of somewhat more than ordinary patience, acuteness and pains. It is Aristotle's theory of "Hamartia," a theory since justified triumphantly in the Elizabethan tragedy, which is a pronounced stroke of genius. By "Hamartia" Aristotle means the error or weakness by which the hero of a tragedy comes to misfortune. It is, however, a specific kind of error or weakness, which, while it compels reprobation, shall challenge compassion. To this day the truth perceived by Aristotle has not been fully accepted. To this day persons far removed from folly persist in confusing the tragic with the merely painful, with the monstrous, with the sentimental and so forth. Aristotle knew better and has here given a touch of the really higher criticism, which goes to the root of the matter, to the deeplying causes of a certain pleasure indissolubly associated with literature.

In his remarks on poetic style Aristotle insists that it should be on the one hand "clear" and yet, on the other, not "low." He specifies the means by which the latter characteristic may be secured, indicating the use of the "unfamiliar" as the means of avoiding "lowness." "Here," says Mr. Saintsbury, "we see that Aristotle (as Dante far later did and as Wordsworth later again did *not*) recognized the necessity of 'poetic diction,' the necessity, that is of causing a slight shock, a slight surprise, in order to bring about the poetic pleasure. By the example which he gives of heightening and lowering the effect alternately, by substituting different words in the same general context, we see how accurately he had divined the importance of this diction." Aristotle's verbal criticisms are never mere dictionary work, but are invariably connected with the literary value of the word.

Our debt to the author of the "Poetics" and the "Rhetoric" is thus summed up in the book before us. "In some respects we have got no further than Aristotle; we are still arguing on his positions, defending or attacking his theses. In others, we have, indeed, got a good deal further, by virtue, chiefly, of the mere accretion of material and experience. We have, perhaps, learned to resign ourselves rather more to the facts than he, with the enthusiasm of the first creative stage still hardly behind him, was able to do. We are less inclined to prescribe to the artist what he shall do and more tempted to accept what the artist does, and see what it can teach, as well as how it can please us. But, in the wider sense of critical method, we have not got so very far beyond him in the poetical division. If we have got beyond him in the direction of prose, as perhaps we have, the advance has been very late, and can hardly be said, even now, to have by common consent, and as a clear matter of fact, covered, occupied and reduced to order the territory on to which it has pushed. Great as are Aristotle's claims in almost every department of human thought with which he meddles, it may be doubted whether in any he deserves a higher place than in this. He is the very Alexander of Criticism, and his conquests in this field remain practically undestroyed, though not unextended, to the present day."

III.

For the three centuries between Aristotle and Dionysius there are but few original texts extant. From what exist, however, and from such notices as are trustworthy, Mr. Saintsbury deems it safe to affirm that attention was almost entirely devoted on the one side to the verbal or material criticism of the Alexandrian and Pergamene schools, on the other to technical rhetoric. On the other hand, for about half a century before and a century after the Christian era, the record of Greek criticism is more creditable. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch and Dion Chrysostom are its most conspicuous names. The first of the trio is pronounced a typical specimen of the literary critic of antiquity. "He has far less force and method and originality than Aristotle, but then he is a student confining himself to rhetoric and history, not a world philosopher, taking up the philosophy of literature merely as a part of a whole. He has far less genius than Longinus; but he is also far more copiously preserved. We read him with respect; we meet just and acute observations in him; we can even occasionally compliment him on something like (never quite) the 'grasp' of the comic fragment. But he is still partly under the limitations of his technical rhetoric, partly under others less easy to describe exactly; and he neglects Latin literature, by his time a very considerable entity. He cannot wholly bring himself to regard literature as literature." With Plutarch the case is much worse; in him the ethical preoccupation is supreme and exclusive. His treatise on education is pervaded with the characteristic Greek conception that book education by itself is education of the most wretchedly inadequate kind. How to give children good morals and healthy bodies, how to keep them or wean them from bad company and foul language; how to practise them in manly sports and exercises; these are Plutarch's principal cares. In the more general tract entitled "How One Should [Hear or] Read," our author finds not only neglect of literary criticism, but positive blasphemy against it, for one is particularly enjoined by Plutarch not to take special pleasure in style and phrase. In the tractate on the "Lives of the Orators," whether it be Plutarch's or not, the writer avoids even the fringe of the literary part of his subject "with an ingenuity that is marvellous, or a stolidity that is more marvellous still." All the great masters of Greek oratory might be Generals or mere jurists, sculptors or fishmongers, for any allusion that the writer makes to the means by which they won their fame. Mr. Saintsbury concedes that Dion Chrysostom was the most literary of the pure rhetoricians, and a favorable example of them, but he is pronounced "only an entertainer, the showman of an art which is not quite coarse, but is certainly not in the highest sense fine." Lucian, somewhat later in point of date, is recognized as "a true artist, a true man of letters and, occasionally, a critic endowed with unerring eyes and the very sword of sharpness itself; but he is this only at times, and even at those times he is too negative."

If we advance a little in time and turn our attention to the strict teaching and practice of rhetoric itself from the second century A. D. onward the spectacle afforded by Greek criticism is even less satisfactory. The work done by innumerable commentators is performed with extreme diligence and even in some cases with remarkable alertness and acuteness, but it is disappointing, unsatisfying and even irritating. "The technical rhetoric, always arbitrarily limited in subject and perversely conventional in method, has practically lost all chance of exercising itself in the noblest of its three divisions. Deliberative oratory is dead, except in exercises and make-believes, and the bread-winning chicanery of forensic, the frivolities (hollow, except as also bread-winning) of epideictic, have usurped the whole room. It might be thought that in this bereaved condition the art would bethink itself of that profitable, dignified and delightful occupation which it had always more or less directly practised, but which had seemed less dignified than persuasion—the art of literary criticism proper. But it does nothing—or but little—of the kind."

Amid this chaos of wasted industry emerges in the second half of the third century A. D. the celebrated treatise commonly attributed to Longinus, which is entitled "Peri hupsous." The current translation "On the Sublime" is deprecated by Mr. Saintsbury as a signification too much specialized with the specialization partly in the wrong direction. Hall, the seventeenth century translator, rendered the Greek word "the height of eloquence," which is more than literally exact, though it is neither elegant nor handy. Our author points out that "the Longinian sublime is not sublimity in its narrower sense, but all that quality or combination of qualities which creates *enthusiasm* in literature, all that gives *consummateness* to it, all that deserves the highest critical encomium either in prose or poetry." Repeated stress is laid upon the fact that if this treatise be not the sole book of antiquity, nay, the sole book, except Dante's "De Vulgari Eloquio," of antiquity the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the earlier modern times to boot, which sets forth the critical ideal that comprehends the formal and the material, the verbal and the ideal merits of literature, at all events the treatise exhibits his comprehension as no other book does. All the other Greek critics have their eyes mainly off the right object, and most of them seem to think it rather vain to look at that object at all. "The intelligent enjoyment of literature, the intimacy with it, at once voluptuous and intellectual; the untiring, though it may be never fully satisfied, quest after the secret of its charms, never neglecting the opportunity of basking and revelling in them—these things, till we come to Longinus, are rare indeed. And when we do meet them the *rencontre* is of a sort of accidental and shamefaced character. When we come to Longinus there is no more false modesty. 'Beautiful words are the light of thought.' These words themselves are the lantern of criticism."

IV.

Of Latin criticism relatively little need be said, although an exception must be made for Quintilian, who himself is here described as, at best, a rather less technical Dionysius of Halicarnassus; indeed, it is uncertain whether he does not owe a good deal directly to Dionysius himself. Mr. Saintsbury admits that it may be unjust to regard Horace's "Epistola ad Pisones" as a designed and complete tract De Arte Poetica. He insists, however, that, whatever allowance may be made for its scheme and purpose, the intrinsic quality of such criticism as the epistle gives will remain unmistakable. Neither of the real nature, requirements and capabilities of any one literary form, nor of the character of any one source of literary beauty does Horace show himself in the least degree conscious. His precepts are now precepts of excellent common sense not less, but rather more, applicable to life than to literature; and, again, arbitrary rules derived from the practice, sometimes quite accidental practice, of great preceding writers. "All the same, Horace, unconsciously, and almost indirectly, does take up a very decided critical side, and expresses with the neatness and in the rememberable fashion to be expected from so consummate a master one of the two great critical creeds. Nor is there any doubt that this creed, so far as literary criticism appealed to the Roman mind at all, was that of by far the larger number of persons. This is the creed of what is known as 'classicism,' the creed which recommends, first of all, as the probable, if not the certain, road to literary success, adherence to the approved traditions, the elaboration of types and generalizations, rather than indulgence in the eccentric, and in efforts to create the individual, the preference of the regular to the vague." This was even more the critical orthodoxy of Rome than it was the critical orthodoxy of Greece.

After all, however, it is suggested that Latin had the criticism which it deserved, the criticism which was made necessary by the specific conditions of its own classic literature, and also the criticism which was really most useful, both for itself and for its posterity, which in greater or less degree was to include, not merely the so-called Romance tongues, but all the literary languages of modern Europe. A literature like classical Latin, which is from first to last *in statu pupillari*, which, with whatever strength, deftness, elegance, even originality at times, follows in the footsteps of another literature, must, for the very life of it, have a critical creed of order, discipline and moderation. Otherwise it would run the risk of being a mere hybrid, even a mere monstrosity. "Still more certainly, nothing could have been better for the future of the world than the exact legacy which Latin left, not merely in its great examples of literature but in the forms of the scholastic grammar and rhetoric, to that millennium of reconstruction and recreation which is called the Middle Age. For that wonderful period—which even yet has never been put in its right place in the history of the world—a higher lesson would have been thrown away, or positively injurious. No instruction in romanticism was wanted by the ages of romance; for full literary knowledge of the ancient literatures they were in no wise suited or prepared. Their business was, after a long period of mere foundation work in the elaboration of the modern languages to get together the materials of the modern literatures and to build up the structure of these as well as they could. So strongly did they feel the *nisus* toward this, that they even travestied into their own likeness such of the old literature as remained."

The substantial, if scarcely exalted, services rendered not only to Latin, but also to posterior criticism, by the famous work on "The Institutes of Oratory," is recognized in the book before us by the allotment of a chapter to Quintilian. While the limitations which he shares with other Latin critics are clearly marked, the work which he did is adequately summed up.

"He has given us a history in little of the choicest Greek and Latin literature; he has drawn and placed for us the contrasted styles, not merely of oratorical, but of all prose composition; he has handled the literary side of grammar with singular fairness and sense; and has dealt more satisfactorily than any other ancient writer with the all-important and most difficult question of euphony in written speech. No one among ancient writers has treated the important but delusive subject of the figures [metaphors, similes, allegories, &c.] with more sense and skill; no one has contrived to get, out of some of the merest technicalities of the rhetoric of the schools, such a solid extract of critical power. The technical observations in Book X form the most invaluable introduction to composition to be found in any language; they put our modern books of the kind to shame, at once by the practical character of their suggestions, and by their freedom from mere mechanical arbitrariness of prescription on points where idiom, good usage and individual ability are really the only arbiters. Lastly, on the all-important and ever-recurring battle of the styles, plain and ornate, Attic and Asiatic, or whatever antithesis be preferred, it would be almost impossible to find a more intelligent pronouncement than Quintilian's." Manifestly, Mr. Saintsbury does not agree with those other writers of our day, including conspicuously Mr. Nettleship, who are disposed to depreciate the Institutes of Oratory. Rather would our author say that the only reproach to which Quintilian is open is one which all antiquity, from Aristotle to Longinus, and including both these great men, shares with him. "This is the reproach of never completely clearing up the mind about rhetoric, and perpetually confusing it with the art of prose literature, or else leaving prose literature without any 'art' at all. We have seen how this confusion arose [from the importance of the rôle of oratory in ancient city-states] and how it was maintained by conditions, which, though working more feebly in Quintilian's days, were still working. The matter came to a head when Lucian formally renounced rhetoric and took to essay writing in dialogue, and when Apuleius in the 'Golden Ass,' mingled declamation, dialogue, philosophy and romance in one *olla podrida* with a daring sauce of new prose style to make it go down. But the barbarians were then at the gates, and the real recognition and reconstruction [of the art of prose composition] was not to take place for ages later, if it has completely taken place even yet."

It is further to be noted that Quintilian with all his merits embodies that distrust of the Romantic which appears so often in the post-Homeric classical ages up to his own time. If he does not absolutely dislike or despise, he ignores, the Romantic element in Xenophon; the "seizing" situation of the Ten Thousand, leaderless though victorious, a handful isolated in the heart of a hostile country, the moving accidents of their journey across the mountain walls and through the warlike clans of Kurdistan, and all the rest, till the site of the sea and the rush to the hilltop to behold it, and the shout of welcome—these things pass entirely unnoticed by him. Astonishing are his dismissals of Lucretius as merely "difficult" and of Catullus as merely "bitter." "The grim force of the Lucretian despair, which would so fain persuade itself to be scientific acquiescence in contemplation from the temples of the wise; the throb of the Catullian passion, are not Quintilian's business. Indeed, what *contio*, what *judices*, would pay any attention to the drift of atoms in the void? What respectable paterfamilias but must highly deprecate verses not merely immoral but extravagant to Ipsithilla and Lesbia; attempts to reproduce in sober Latin the Greek ravings of a Sappho or about an Attis? Apollonius Rhodius, too, who, to us, seems a Romantic before Romanticism, touches no chord in Quintilian's breast. And we may be tolerably certain that the chords which were not responsive in the breast of Quintilian were at least equally mute in other breasts of his time." Our author adds that such shortcomings were not only inevitable, but, for the purpose of the historian, they are almost welcome. "We may protest as lovers, but we register and interpret as students. Moreover, Quintilian, like all the greater men in all periods, and some even of the smaller in some, supplies us with a great deal of matter for registration and interpretation, without any protest at all." Mr. Saintsbury repeats that "it would be possible by a process of mere 'lifting-out' with hardly any important garbling of phrase, to extract from the Institutions a treatise on composition and critical reading which would be of no mean bulk, of no narrow range and would contain a very large proportion of strictly relevant and valuable detail. This treatise, moreover, would be illuminated—for practically the only time, in the range of ancient literature on the subject, to any considerable extent—by that searchlight of criticism, the comparative method; while it would also display, throughout, the other illuminative powers of wide reading, sound judgment and an excellent and by no means merely pedestrian common sense."

V.

We pass to the hundred pages assigned to the contribution of the mediæval period to literary criticism. The contribution contains nothing of consequence, with the exception of Dante's treatise *De Vulgari Eloquio*. What else there is of criticism consists mainly of agreeable babblings, of school books and of incidental utterances. On the other hand, Mr. Saintsbury holds that, by the *De Vulgari* itself, the Middle Ages lodged such a diploma piece as has been scarcely seen half a dozen times elsewhere in the history of the world. It is well known that the purpose of Dante's work was to prove that Italians should write poetry in their native tongue, the *lingua de Si*, rather than in Provencal, the *Lingua d'Oco*. In the course of the discussion, Dante recognizes and points out the differentia of poetry from prose, to wit: its presentation of the subject in metrical form, with musical accompaniments, whether of actual music or of melodious words. He knows, and virtually says, that prose writers may treat the same subjects, but he knows that the poet's treatment is different, and he goes straight for the difference. Where does he find it? Exactly where Wordsworth, 500 years later, refused to find it, namely, in poetic diction and in metre. What Dante has to say about metre receives but little notice in the book before us, because the poet's remarks upon the subject are of limited and particular application. Had Dante completed his treatise, it would still have dealt solely with Romance, if not exclusively with Italian poetry. More interesting are his observations on style and diction, because, with few exceptions, they are of universal application. The chapter on words, the so-called chapter of "The Sieve," is that which contains the heart and kernel of Dante's criticism. "Dwell as much as he may on the importance of arrangement and phrase, it is impossible that these should be beautiful without beautiful words to make them of. And his system of 'sifting,' quaint as its phraseology may seem at first sight, arbitrary as some of its divisions may appear and here and there difficult as it may be to follow him, is a perfectly sound scheme and only requires working out at greater length. The objection to *puerilia*, though it may be too sweepingly expressed, is absolutely just, and cuts away Wordsworth's childishnesses by anticipation." It is the great stress which Dante lays upon the beauty and melody of words which causes him to condemn translations.

"Nothing harmonized by the laws of the Muses can be changed from one tongue to another without destroying all its sweetness and harmony. This (which is arch-true) connects itself directly with Dante's unerring direction towards the criticism of form. If 'all depends on the subject' [as most of the Greek and Latin critics said] translation can do no harm, for the subject can be presented in exactly the same conditions through more languages than Mezzofanti, or Prince Lucien Bonaparte ever meddled with. But the form, the language, the charm of the verse, the music of the composition, they go utterly and inevitably; and even if the translator succeeds in putting something in their place it is something else and not themselves. In a word, we find Dante, in opposition to Aristotle and to all ancient critics except Longinus, recognizing the ultimate and real test of literary excellence as lying in the expression, not in the meaning. Our author thinks that this, if it stood alone would be in itself a thing so great that no greater is to be met with in the history of criticism. "Even yet, the truth which Longinus taught but as in a Pisgah-sight, which Dante himself rather felt and illustrated throughout than consciously or deliberately championed in any particular place—the truth that the criticism of literature is, first of all, the criticism of expression as regards the writer, of impression as regards the reader—is far from being universally recognized, far even from being a prevailing or a popular doctrine. By many it is still regarded as an unquestionable heresy, by others as a questionable half-truth."

Not, of course, that Dante was himself by any means indifferent to the "subject," as distinguished from expression. "On the contrary, his great three-fold division of the subjects of high poetry into *Salus*, *Venus*, *Virtus*—Arms, Love and Religiously-Guided Philosophy—is to this day the best that exists. Here, too, Dante has made a notable advance on the ancients in admitting love to equality in principle, to the primacy (I had almost said) in practice. We have seen how the good Servius found it necessary to apologize for the fourth book of the Æneid as dealing with the trifling subject of love; we know how Greek criticism slighted Euripides, not, as it might have done, for his literary shortcomings, but because of his reliance on the tender passion; we know, further, how, except in mystical philosophizing of the Platonic kind, there is nothing satisfactory on the matter anywhere—that not merely Dionysius but Longinus, in the very act of preserving for us the two chief love poems of the ancient world, can find nothing adequate to say about them, and that Aristotle leaves the subject severely alone. Here, also, Dante knew better; here, also, he expressed consummately all the enormous gain of dream which the sleep of the Dark Ages had poured into the heart and the soul of the world." Herein, however, he was only one of a myriad. From Brittany to Transylvania and from Iceland to Provence the whole thirteenth century, if not the whole twelfth, also, had been "full of love;" there had been no fear of "Venus" being forgotten.

In his final chapter Mr. Saintsbury returns to this theme and shows how important to criticism became the attitude of the Middle Ages to love, an attitude mainly conditioned by their attitude to religion. In his opinion the not infrequent, though very idle, debate as to whether the Venus of chivalry was the Venus Urania or Venus Pandemos is best avoided by the frank acknowledgment that she was both. The distinction from antiquity and its influence upon literature do not lie in this direction or in the fact of the mixture, but in its nature and character. "With exceptions, of course, the tone of antiquity in literature as to love and to its objects is either the tone of slightly, unreal philosophizing or the tone of the naughty story or that of half-paraded, half-confessing contempt." To an average serious man of letters in the classical period love and its objects were, when not a subject for conventional escapades, a rather regrettable incident attached to humanity, something only not among the *parerga* or byworks of life, because it is almost impossible to avoid it, something useful, not unpleasant, rather better than a constitutional or a bath, but affording a much less worthy employment than talking in a court or declaiming in a school. "This is undeniably the average attitude of the average man of letters of old. That of his Mediæval brother need hardly be described, but its causes come within our view. You have to reckon not merely with the cult of the Virgin, as has often been done, but with the whole Christian (especially Mediæval Christian) theory of morals and of sin." A Greek gentleman and scholar would ask: "Why excite yourselves about actions indifferent at best, always rather below the attention of a serious man, and, at worst, leading to unpleasant and dubious consequences?" Excitement, on the other hand, becomes easy when, as the Mediæval Christians believed, the consequences of a moment's guilty indulgence may be the Inferno for eternity. From a less purely selfish point of view there were reasons enough for the new attitude of the Middle Ages toward the sexual passion. Imagination—the real imagination of Apollonius or Philostratus, not the mere image-furnishing faculty of the ancients generally—had come to town and brought a transformed Love with her. The sense of mystery, of miracle, of the invisible, grafted itself upon the strongest of the merely physical instincts, and the result pervaded literature. What formerly had been looked upon as a trumpery subject, proper for comedy, for epic episodes, for a carefully kept-under seasoning to tragedy, for light trifles, became, with religion, the subject of nearly all poetry and of not a little prose and made its influence felt in all manner of ways.

M. W. H.